

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR
LAS VEGAS, NV 89134

1 Lars K. Evensen
Nevada Bar No. 8061
2 Jenapher Lin
Nevada Bar No. 14233
3 HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
4 Las Vegas, NV 89134
Phone: 702.669.4600
5 Fax: 702.669.4650
lkevensen@hollandhart.com
6 jlin@hollandhart.com

7 P. Sterling Kerr
Nevada Bar No. 3978
8 KERR SIMPSON ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2900 W. Horizon Ridge Parkway, Suite 200
9 Henderson, NV 89052
Phone: 702.451.2055
10 Fax: 702.451.2077
sterling@kerrsimpsonlaw.com

11 *Attorneys for International Markets Live Inc.,*
12 *IM Mastery Academy Ltd., Assiduous, Inc.,*
13 *Christopher Terry, and Isis Terry*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION; and
16 STATE OF NEVADA,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 INTERNATIONAL MARKETS LIVE INC.,
a corporation, also d/b/a IYOVIA,
iMarketsLive, IM Mastery Academy, and IM
20 Academy; IM MASTERY ACADEMY
LTD., f/k/a International Markets Live Ltd., a
21 United Kingdom company; ASSIDUOUS,
INC., a corporation; GLOBAL DYNASTY
22 NETWORK, LLC., a limited liability
company; CHRISTOPHER TERRY,
23 individually and as an owner and officer of
International Markets Live Inc.; ISIS
24 TERRY, fka ISIS DE LA TORRE,
individually and as an owner and officer of
25 International Markets Live Inc., IM Mastery
Academy Ltd., and Assiduous, Inc.; JASON
26 BROWN, individually and as an officer of
International Markets Live Inc. and as a
27 member of Global Dynasty Network, LLC;
ALEX MORTON, individually and as an
28 officer of International Markets Live Inc.;

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00760-CDS-NJK

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE
TO RESPOND TO
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION (ECF No. 42)
(Second Request)**

MATTHEW ROSA, individually and as a
member of Global Dynasty Network, LLC;
and BRANDON BOYD,

Defendants.

Defendants INTERNATIONAL MARKETS LIVE INC. (“IML”), IM MASTERY
ACADEMY LTD. (“IM Academy”), ASSIDUOUS, INC. (“Assiduous”), CHRISTOPHER TERRY
 (“Mr. Terry”), and ISIS TERRY (“Ms. Terry”) (collectively, as “Moving Defendants”), by and
through their undersigned counsel of record, the law firms of Holland & Hart LLP and Kerr Simpson
Attorneys at Law, and pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“FRCP” or
 “Rule”), hereby respectfully submit this timely *Reply* (the “Reply”) in support of *Motion to Extend*
Deadline (the “Motion to Extend”; ECF No. 50) to respond to the *Motion for Preliminary Injunction*
(the “PI Motion”; ECF No. 42), filed May 30, 2025, by Plaintiffs FEDERAL TRADE
COMMISSION (the “FTC”) and STATE OF NEVADA (the “State” and collectively, with FTC, as
 “Plaintiffs”), and in advance of the current deadline (June 27, 2025), requesting a 90-day
extension—to **September 25, 2025**. This is the first motion, but the second request (*see* SAO to
Extend, ECF Nos. 47, 52), to extend the deadline to respond to the PI Motion. This Reply is made
and based upon the pleadings and papers on file herein, the below Memorandum of Points and
Authorities, and any oral argument that this Court allows at the time of any hearing scheduled on
the Motion(s).

DATED this 18th day of June 2025.

HOLLAND & HART LLP

/s/ Lars K. Evensen

Lars K. Evensen
Jenapher Lin
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89134

P. Sterling Kerr
KERR SIMPSON ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2900 W. Horizon Ridge Parkway, Suite 200
Henderson, NV 89052

*Attorneys for Defendants International Markets
Live Inc., IM Mastery Academy Ltd.,
Assiduous, Inc., Christopher Terry, Isis Terry*

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION & ARGUMENT¹

For good cause appearing, the Court should extend the deadline to respond to Plaintiffs' PI Motion by 90 days—to **September 25, 2025**. This is particularly true given that Plaintiffs' Response lacks any cogent argument for why the instant Motion to Extend (ECF No. 50) should not be granted. *See generally* Resp. (ECF No. 57).

As Plaintiffs are well aware, "in the Ninth Circuit, 'in [the] absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice to the adverse party,' requests for extensions made before the applicable deadline has passed should normally be granted." *Dickson v. Nevada*, No. 2:21-cv-00999-JAD-EJY, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44422, at *8 (D. Nev. Mar. 12, 2025) (quoting *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010)) (alteration in original). Here, this Motion to Extend (ECF No. 50) is timely filed in advance of the applicable deadline (June 27, 2025), is made in good faith and not for any improper purposes or delay, and no prejudice to Plaintiffs results from the granting of this Motion to Extend.

The instant Motion is seeking a reasonable extension so that defendants have adequate time to fully respond to the PI Motion. Plaintiffs do not argue that 90 days is an unreasonable amount of time. In fact, Plaintiffs were more than willing to give Defendants Global Dynasty, Brown, and Rosa 90 days. (ECF Nos. 46, 58). Nonetheless, Plaintiffs have gone to great lengths to ensure that Moving Defendants are not given any more than two weeks to respond to the accusations set forth in the PI Motion and the extensive, all encompassing injunctive relief sought by the FTC.²

¹ As an initial matter, the Court should strike Plaintiffs' *Consolidated Response (1) Motion to Extend Deadline to Respond to Motion for Preliminary Injunction and (2) Motion For Rule 16 Conference* (ECF Nos. 50, 53, 54, 56) (ECF No. 57) as it fails to comply with LR IC 2.2(b) ("For each type of relief requested or purpose of the document, a separate document must be filed and a separate event must be selected for that document."). In so doing, Plaintiffs group together their arguments, making it needlessly difficult to decipher what points and arguments go to which motion.

² As set forth in the Motion to Extend, Plaintiffs steadfastly refused to extend the response deadline beyond 14 days (from June 13th to June 27th), which were essentially spent on negotiating, drafting/revising, and obtaining approval of counsel for all parties for the SAO (ECF No. 47), followed by the filing on the instant Motion to Extend (ECF No. 50) so that the issue could be presented to the Court and hopefully adjudicated prior to the expiration of the current June 27th deadline. *See, e.g., Corral v. Nat'l Consumer Telecom & Utils. Exch., Inc.*, No. 2:25-cv-00019-

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR
LAS VEGAS, NV 89134

1 Particularly unavailing are Plaintiffs’ feigned outcries of prejudice, which essentially can
2 be summed up as “because, the sooner, the better.” *See, e.g.*, Resp. (ECF No. 57 at 8). But the Court
3 has yet to set a hearing date for the PI Motion; nor did Plaintiffs find the circumstances so urgent as
4 to warrant moving for a TRO.

5 The fact that “Plaintiffs submitted 1,794 pages from IML’s compliance database” (ECF
6 No. 57 at 6) ignores the remaining 5,134 pages attached to Plaintiffs’ PI Motion (ECF No. 42) at
7 issue, which includes a 564-page expert report (ECF No. 42-23) and 12 videos (ECF No. 43).
8 Further, the 1,794 pages is out of millions of pages amounting to terabytes worth of data that was
9 produced to the FTC in response to the CIDs—FTC’s argument that defendants should be able to
10 guess which documents the FTC was going to attach to its PI Motion is simply nonsensical.

11 Similarly meritless is Plaintiffs’ argument that additional time should not be granted to
12 defendants because Plaintiffs sent a copy of the complaint to defendants months ago (ECF No. 57 at
13 8). Plaintiffs’ Response merely opines that defendants should be able to respond in the given time,
14 which is not the non-rigorous, “good cause” standard applicable. *See Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures,*
15 *Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). In effect, Plaintiffs suggest defendants should have been
16 clairvoyant in knowing the contents of Plaintiffs’ PI Motion as well as the supporting information
17 Plaintiffs’ would have attached, including information that was produced by third parties and other
18 defendants.

19 Plaintiffs’ speculations do not constitute good cause for denying the reasonable extension
20 requested. Plaintiffs speculate that “the sooner a preliminary injunction is granted requiring
21 Defendants to preserve such data, the higher the chance that such relevant information will be
22 preserved.” (ECF No. 57 at 10). Plaintiffs apply self-serving speculation, that Moving Defendants
23 are not preserving data, to justify their Response. Similarly, Plaintiffs’ speculations as to Individual
24 Defendants’ spending and the financial condition of Moving Defendants are not good cause to deny
25 a reasonable extension. (ECF No. 57 at 10).

26 Preliminary injunctions are to preserve the status quo, which is not what Plaintiffs are

27 _____
28 JCM-MDC, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 70516, at *3 (D. Nev. Apr. 10, 2025) (“Generally, ‘good cause’
is equated with diligence.”).

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR
LAS VEGAS, NV 89134

attempting to do. *See, e.g., Stanley v. Univ. of S. California*, 13 F.3d 1313, 1320 (9th Cir. 1994) (“A prohibitory injunction preserves the status quo.”); *Gladwill v. Ruby Pipeline, LLC*, No. 3:11-CV-00251-RCJ, 2013 WL 144268, at *7 (D. Nev. Jan. 10, 2013) (“Where the purpose of the injunction is to require affirmative acts, or a mandatory injunction, the court should exercise restraint and caution when considering such a request. Mandatory injunctions, which disrupt the status quo, are particularly disfavored and subject to a greater degree of scrutiny.” (internal citation omitted)).

Tellingly absent from Plaintiffs’ Response any attempt to address the fact that Plaintiffs have sought a 60-day stay all deadlines with respect to Defendants Global Dynasty, Brown, and Rosa (ECF No. 46) so that “the FTC can seek Commission approval of a proposed stipulated final order for permanent injunction and monetary judgment to resolve all Plaintiffs’ claims as to the GDN Defendants” (ECF No. 46 at 2), seeking 30 days for those defendants to respond should the settlement be rejected—*i.e.*, the same 90-day period being sought here. Certainly, this request creates a potential mismatch in the preliminary injunction timeline; do Plaintiffs anticipate one preliminary injunction hearing for certain defendants and another for Defendants Global Dynasty, Brown, and Rosa?

Notably, during this interim period, Plaintiffs have not sought a corresponding preliminary injunction against Defendants Global Dynasty, Brown, and Rosa, which calls into question whether and to what extent the requested preliminary injunction is really meant to preserve the status quo.

In sum, Moving Defendants seek a reasonable extension well in advance of the current June 27th deadline and good cause exists to grant the requested extension so as to afford Moving Defendants sufficient time to fully and adequately respond to Plaintiffs’ PI Motion.

II. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, IML, IM Academy, Assiduous, Mr. Terry, and Ms. Terry respectfully request that the Court grant the instant Motion to Extend (ECF No. 50) and, for good cause appearing, allow a 90-day extension to the deadline to respond to Plaintiffs’ 61-page PI Motion—to **September 25, 2025**. Alternatively, should the Court not be inclined to grant the requested 90-day extension, good cause exists to warrant, at minimum, a 60-day extension—to **August 11, 2025**—the same period in which Plaintiffs have sought to stay the deadlines as to

1 Defendants Global Dynasty, Brown, and Rosa (ECF Nos. 46, 58) without seeking a corresponding
2 preliminary injunction against them for the interim period.

3 DATED this 18th day of June 2025.

HOLLAND & HART LLP

4
5 /s/ Lars K. Evensen

Lars K. Evensen

Jenapher Lin

6 9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor

7 Las Vegas, NV 89134

8 P. Sterling Kerr

KERR SIMPSON ATTORNEYS AT LAW

9 2900 W. Horizon Ridge Parkway, Suite 200

Henderson, NV 89052

10 *Attorneys for Defendants International Markets*

11 *Live Inc., IM Mastery Academy Ltd.,*

12 *Assiduous, Inc., Christopher Terry, Isis Terry*

HOLLAND & HART LLP
9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR
LAS VEGAS, NV 89134

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 18th day of June 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION (ECF NO. 42) (Second Request) was served by the
 following method(s):

- ☒ **Electronic:** by submitting electronically for filing and/or service with the United States District Court, District of Nevada's e-filing system and/or served on counsel electronically in accordance with the E-service list to the following email addresses:

Thomas M. Biesty
 Laura C. Basford
 J. Ronald Brooke, Jr.
 Joshua A. Doan
 Federal Trade Commission
 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, CC-6316
 Washington, DC 20580
tbiesty@ftc.gov
lbasford@ftc.gov
jbrooke@ftc.gov
jdoan@ftc.gov

Attorneys for Federal Trade Commission

Phillip A. Silvestri
 GREENSPOON MARDER, PA
 3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 400
 Las Vegas, NV 89169
 702-978-4249
 Fax: 954-333-4256
phillip.silvestri@gmlaw.com

Attorneys for Global Dynasty Network, LLC, Jason Brown, Matthew Rosa

Alina Veneziano
 OBERHEIDEN P.C.
 11035 Lavender Hill Dr. Ste. 160, #246
 Las Vegas, NV 89135
 702-209-7570
alina@federal-lawyer.com

Attorneys for Alex Morton

Aaron D. Ford
 Ernest D. Figueroa
 Lucas J. Tucker
 Samantha B. Feeley
 STATE OF NEVADA, OFFICE OF
 ATTORNEY GENERAL
 BUREAU OF CONSUMER PROTECTION
 8945 W. Russell Road, #204
 Las Vegas, NV 89148
efigueroa@ag.nv.gov
ltucker@ag.nv.gov
sfeeley@ag.nv.gov

Attorneys for State of Nevada

Z. Ryan Pahnke
 RAY QUINNEY & NEBEKER
 36 S State St Ste 1400
 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
 801-532-1500
 Fax: 801-532-1500
rpahnke@rqn.com

David J. Malley
 Nevada Bar No. 8171
 HUTCHISON & STEFFEN PLLC
 10080 W. Alta Drive, Suite 200
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
 Telephone: (702) 385-2500
 Email: dmalley@rhutchlegal.com

Attorneys for Brandon Boyd

/s/ Tiffany Pond
 An Employee of Holland & Hart LLP

HOLLAND & HART LLP
 9555 HILLWOOD DRIVE, 2ND FLOOR
 LAS VEGAS, NV 89134